

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In response to the rejection of claims, claims 1, 4-8, 10, 13-15, 18-19 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over patent US7006129 (McClure) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0003571 (Schofield), the applicant traverses the rejection.

More specifically the combination of citations does not suggest a processor "arranged to display different views from different cameras one after the other on the display" as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Thus, amended claims 1 and 10 are allowable and rejection of claims 1 and 10 should be withdrawn. Also, claims 4-8, 13-15, 18-19 and 21-22 are dependent on either claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 10.

In response to the rejection of claims, claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,006,129 (McClure) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003571 (Schofield), and further in view of US7266219 to Okamoto, the applicant traverses the rejection.

More specifically the combination of citations does not suggest a processor "arranged to display different views from different cameras one after the other on the display" as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Thus, amended claims 1 and 10 are allowable and claims 2 and 11 are dependent on either claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 10.

In response to the rejection of claims, claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

7,006,129 (McClure) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003571 (Schofield), and further in view of DE29612536 to Li, the applicant traverses the rejection.

More specifically the combination of citations does not suggest a processor "arranged to display different views from different cameras one after the other on the display" as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Thus, amended claims 1 and 10 are allowable and claims 3 and 12 are dependent on either claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 10.

In response to the rejection of claims, claims 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,006,129 (McClure) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003571 (Schofield), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0053690 (Trifonov), the applicant traverses the rejection.

More specifically the combination of citations does not suggest a processor "arranged to display different views from different cameras one after the other on the display" as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Thus, amended claims 1 and 10 are allowable and claims 17 and 20 are dependent on either claims 1 or 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 10.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Applicant may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Senior Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9643